

claims, if amended as proposed, do not present new issues requiring further consideration or search. The amendment had not been previously filed because Applicants felt their proffered arguments and evidence would suffice to overcome the rejection of Claims 4-10, 15, 16 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. However, since the Examiner was not persuaded, Applicants are now amending the claims in a good faith attempt to overcome the final, sole rejection. Thus, Applicants respectfully request entry and favorable consideration of the claims, as amended.

It is noted for the record that, despite the present amendment, Applicants still disagree with the Examiner's position on the merits of the rejection and the basis of the written description requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. They are nevertheless pleased to read on page 4 of the Office action that the Office recognizes that there is natural sequence divergence between various PCV2 isolates. Such recognition by the Office is appreciated.

Applicants further acknowledge with much gratitude that the Examiner kindly held Claims 1-3 and 32-38 allowable. Applicants are also grateful that the Examiner generously withdrew the rejection of Claims 4-10, 15, 16 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Insofar as the withdrawn Claims 23-28 (Group V) are concerned, they have been retained here and throughout prosecution to afford the Examiner the opportunity to rejoin the process claims with the allowable product claims. Regarding this point, the Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to an earlier Office action mailed September 7, 2005 in which the practice of rejoinder was made available to these set of claims ("should the elected product of Group I (now encompassing the subject matter of Group VII) be found allowable, the method of Group V can be rejoined, assuming that co-dependency is maintained throughout prosecution"). Consequently, Applicants respectfully ask that the Examiner kindly rejoin the process Claims 23-28 and allow the application to issue as a patent.

If any outstanding question remains, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for a discussion of mutually agreeable solutions.

Accordingly, it is believed that this application is now in condition for an allowance.
Favorable treatment is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

VIRGINIA TECH INTELLECTUAL
PROPERTIES, INC. and IOWA STATE
UNIVERSITY RESEARCH
FOUNDATION, INC.

Date: October 20, 2006

By: Anne M. Rosenblum
Anne M. Rosenblum
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 30,419

FILING BY EXPRESS MAIL UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.10

This correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on October 20, 2006 to be delivered by the "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under Mailing Label Number EQ 643041202 US addressed to: MS AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Anne M. Rosenblum
Anne M. Rosenblum